DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 333 829 HE 024 685

AUTHOR Cohen, Audrey C.
TITLE The Third Alternative. New Edition.
INSTITUTION College for Human Services, New York, N. Y.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 33p.; For a related document, see HE 024 687.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; *Competency Based Education; *Educational Change; Educational Objectives; *Educational Philosophy; Futures (of Society); *Higher Education; Job Performance; Models; *Professional Training; Service Occupations; Service Workers; Theory Practice Relationship; *Vocational Education; Vocational Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *College for Human Services NY

ABSTRACT

The recent development of a service society where a majority of occupations are service related has called for of a new model for higher education, a departure from the traditional universities modeled on the medieval ideal and the recent variations on that model. This new model, the third alternative, is a performance based system that integrates theory with practice, assumes that the professional is primarily responsible to the client rather than simply to supervisors or to a bureaucracy, and that professional competence must be redefined in broad, humanistic terms. This model is more egalitarian than earlier models because it recognizes that ability and effectiveness are built on more than academic skills. This model has been implemented at the College for Human Services in New York. The curriculum includes a major role for the client in setting and strengthening performance standards, periodic assessment of professionals throughout their working lives, and a blend of theory and practice. Eight generic competency areas, or "crystals" serve as an organizing principle for the curriculum. Faculty in this setting function in the service setting as well as within the institution. Assessment instruments, a series of Constructive Actions, allow the students to evaluate their progress. Twenty four foot-notes and a chart showing the Eight Competency Crystals are included. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED333829

THE THIRD ALTERNATIVE

AUDREY C. COHEN

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Audrey C. Cohen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

THE COLLEGE FOR HUMAN SERVICES

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE 024 685

THE THIRD ALTERNATIVE

AUDREY C. COHEN

THE COLLEGE FOR HUMAN SERVICES

The College for Human Services gratefully acknowledges the support of the Banbury Fund for the preparation of this publication.

The Third Alternative was originally published in 1975. In this new edition it has undergone minor revisions for the sake of clarity, and a preface has been added to bring the subject up to date.

Revised edition
© copyright 1988 The College for Human Services
345 Hudson Street
New York, N.Y. 10014

All rights reserved.

Preface

LOOKING BACK, LOOKING AHEAD

In 1975, when *The Third Alternative* was published, the College had just completed four intensive years of research and development culminating in the introduction of a new educational system. This new educational system was specifically designed to prepare people for the society of the future—the service society. It represented exactly the kind of integrated, transdisciplinary, rigorous yet worldly education that I had envisioned at the start of our prolonged planning effort . And yet I think all of us involved in that heady enterprise were impressed at how rich, how logical, how multidimensional in its benefits our new educational design turned out to be. I felt, and continue to feel, that the result was a new kind of education. In *The Third Alternative*, one of my first efforts to explain this new educational design, I tried to place our new educational model in relationship to existing models of education.

Our new educational system was more than just a course of study. Focused on the demands of the new world of service, our new educational system provided us with a new way of developing a transdisciplinary curriculum. It provided a new way for faculty to work with each other, with their students, and with constituencies in the world outside academia. It provided a new way of selecting people for admission and assessing their learning as they progressed through the program. Above all, it gave us a way to continually renew our commitment to a purposeful education, an education built around a service ethic.

The mid-1970s, when *The Third Alternative* was written, were a time of educational experimentation. When I analyzed these experiments, however, I found that for the most part they were variations on the traditional model of the university, with certain new options to accommodate student desires for greater freedom and self direction. They did not address the basic fact that the society of the future will be a great society or a society doomed to failure depending on whether the people of this nation and others throughout the world are willing and able to adopt a service ethic—an ethic of helping others.

On the occasion of the republication of *The Third Alternative,* I think it is worthwhile to look back at some of the new directions I pointed to in this paper and see what progress has been made in each one of them in the interim. There are six aspects of the College for Human Services educational model that I would like to look at briefly. First, I would like to look at the underlying rationale for this new education. Has the growth of the service economy continued, and if so, how have institutions of education addressed this fundamental change in the way people live and the work they do? Then

I would like to look at specific components of the College for Human Services model: The student body, the curriculum, the faculty role, and assessment.

1. What do we know about the shift to a service economy?

In 1975, when I said that the economy was already 70 percent service oriented, I was making what for many was a shocking claim. Today, this shift is recognized. By 1987, service industries accounted for 75% of all jobs. Between 1976 and 1986, 85% of the new jobs in the private sector were service jobs. It is understood by now that these are not low-end, unproductive jobs with little value to the economy or to the individuals who hold them. We know that the service sector includes industries that are as large and as capital intensive as manufacturing industries. The service sector embraces luxury services but also services that are critical to fulfilling human needs, including such services as communications, finance, transportation, education, and health care. Efficient and high quality services are crucial not only to consumers but also to manufacturers, for whom financial services, communications, distribution, and retailing are vital functions. We know that in a recession, when the demand for durable products falls off, the demand for such essential services as education, health care, and communications may actually grow.[1]

In short, Americans are much more aware than they were in the 70's that the service economy is very much with us, that it is growing, and that this is a positive, not a negative, development. The College for Human Service has adapted to this growing awareness. In 1975, the College for Human Services prepared students for professional positions as teachers, counselors, and mental health administrators. Today we are also preparing a growing number of students for service positions in the business world.

Another positive development is a growing national concern about the need for what I call a service ethic. Major corporations recognize that their business success depends on serving their customers well. Bank managers must show respect for each customer and learn to be sensitive to the concerns of the community. Marketing managers must learn what new or better services will persuade customers to choose their product—be that product a service or a tangible. College presidents worry about the profit motive gone wild in the me-too generation and urge their students to gain greater breadth of experience by providing volunteer services in the community.

1. Quinn, James Brian, Jordan J. Baruch, Penny Cushman Paquette: "Technology in Services." *Scientific American*, December 1987

Has this rising awareness of the nature and demands of the service economy affected education in this country? The answer, unfortunately, is no, not yet. The emphasis in our schools is still on individualism and competition, not on working together, respecting others, acknowledging our community of interest. Business students may have a required course in ethics, but they do not learn how to build their business success on an ethic of concern for others and a wise balancing of the interests of the many constituencies they serve. Liberal arts students may take time out from their studies to tutor children in a local school, but in their classes, their professors are still reluctant to help them make connections between Othello or Tom Jones and the problems of a society where millions of children are dropping out of school.

2. Do we have new ways of selecting students?

How do we decide who is ready for a College education? In 1975 I pointed out that the qualities that show a readiness for an education focused on service include motivation and the ability to work with others as well as academic skills. Although we welcomed people of any age and income to the College for Human Services, this was not open admissions. On the contrary: we were asking for a demonstration of ability and achievement over a broader area than was customary. Many of the students who met our requirements had been out of school for some time, and test-taking was difficult for them. Using highly individualized assessment procedures, we selected students with extraordinary qualifications: a sense of responsibility to their community; experience in reaching out and helping others; an ability to draw on their experience; a determination to overcome all obstacles in order to reach their education and career goals. We found in them an extraordinary capacity to take on multiple responsibilities and deal with complex concerns.

Students like these represent a wealth of talent that our society cannot afford to waste. And indeed, for a time in this country there was a real effort to ensure that people of every age, color, and background had access to a good education. But this effort has not carried through. For example, it is now widely recognized that existing standardized admissions tests are of little help in determining who has the motivation to complete a rigorous college program and the commitment to put it to good use. Yet these standardized tests are still the usual way of screening applicants. When educators talk of college admission based on merit, they don't really mean merit. They mean the ability to succeed on a test that has been proved irrelevant.

Worse still, the nation has lost its commitment to help nontraditional students go to college. Federal financial aid for students,

supposedly designed to ensure equal access, favors traditional college age students living at home over students who support themselves. New limits on student loans discriminate against those most in need of financial assistance.

3. Have we brought our curricula up to date?

The experience of the College for Human Services has shown that it is possible to build a truly transdisciplinary curriculum, a curriculum in which every topic contributes to the student's increasingly comprehensive understanding of themselves and the world they live in. Simply stated, our way of achieving a transdisciplinary curriculum is to organize all the learning for each semester in ways that help students draw on their learning to make a difference in the world. Instead of focusing on the distinctions between the disciplines and choosing the one discipline that they will specialize in, our students learn to bring together relevant elements from the liberal arts, the social sciences, and business and professional research and practice and draw on them to achieve worthwhile purposes.

For other colleges and universities, the goal of a transdisciplinary curriculum has proved elusive. By and large, they have not succeeded in going beyond the special interdisciplinary course or such standard interdisciplinary majors as American Studies or Women's Studies. When new departments are created around these interdisciplinary offerings, they tend to develop their own segregated areas of interest and special methodologies. These "interdisciplinary" departments do not teach students to look at living problems in the real world in a comprehensive way. They do not help students bring all the resources of a college education together to find ways of making a difference in the world. Unless we are talking about career education, narrowly defined, education does not take place in the context of purpose. Our faculty are not challenged to think about how their discipline relates to problems in the real world. They may believe that the study of their subject leads to wisdom, but they are very leery of helping students move toward wisdom by testing the ideas of great thinkers against pressing issues in the real world.

4. Has the college faculty changed?

Inside the scholarly straightjacket that academicians must adopt, I sometimes catch a glimpse of the whole person struggling to get out. At the College for Human Services, we expect our faculty to serve in multiple roles that enable them to stretch beyond their disciplines. Our faculty members are scholars and activists, teachers, counselors, and role models. Many have advanced degrees that reflect the multiplicity of their interests—philosophy and business administration, for example, or mathematics and counseling. Others combine a scholarly background in an area such as

French literature with extensive professional work as counselors or community organizers. Teaching is only one facet of this faculty's role in providing an education for the service age. They also visit students at their field placements in working service organizations, assess their performance as service providers, and meet with their supervisors to plan the field curriculum. At the College, faculty members work in teams to plan the total learning experience for one group of students. Freed from the constraints of academic departments, these faculty have an opportunity for real and purposeful collaboration.

Unfortunately, this convergence of traditionally disparate roles around the purpose of educating people for the service age is still almost unheard of. Yet how liberating it can be! Here is an opportunity for faculty to constantly juxtapose their subject with real life problems and observe at first hand the kind of thinking process their discipline engenders. What kind of questions do the various disciplines encourage us to ask, what methodologies do they favor, what insights do they lead to? Do we dare to look at the gaps that are left, the alternative viewpoints that are needed to get a well rounded sense of these real world problems? Do we dare to look at the ethical implications of our discipline's narrow world view? At my model III institution, faculty face these questions every day. I firmly believe that if more faculty had the opportunity to work this way they would never want to give it up.

5. How do we assess learning?

In 1975, I said that students must be assessed on their ability to achieve worthwhile goals in the real world. Since then, there have been some interesting developments in competency testing, but they have not necessarily led to greater relevance in the overall approach to testing. In general, student learning is still assessed in bits and pieces, and without any reference to the ability of students to make good use of what they have learned. It is well known that such tests do not correlate with later success in life. But the more serious problem is that they do not correlate with *effectiveness* in later life.

It simply is not sufficient that students be able to do the things that tests and paper assignments measure: that they memorize the required facts, that they learn to use analytical methods, that they begin to develop their own interesting theories, or even that they show the ability to use certain real life skills, such as accounting skills or counseling skills. Facts are useless until we know how to marshal them for the accomplishment of some worthwhile purpose. Sophisticated analytical abilities may be used—and frequently are—in purely self serving ways. Research that results in new knowledge may contribute little or nothing to the solution of the very real problems we face, and may in fact do violence to an ethic of service to others.

At the College for Human Services we believe that *all* learning must be assessed in the context of an effort to solve a real life problem. That is why we require that students demonstrate their learning in Constructive Actions. History, literature, science, philosophy, counseling, and management skills, all are assessed in relation to the student's constructive effort to improve the world. We have tried this system and it works. Today, more than ever, I recommend the constructive action assessment process to my colleagues.

In sum, the times have changed, and higher education has not changed with them. And so, thirteen years after *The Third Alternative* first appeared, I renew my call for a new kind of education adapted to the service age.

A note on the chart in the Appendix

The chart at the back of this volume tells something about the stage we had reached when this paper was published. The chart presents, in the briefest form, the parameters that our faculty has used since 1974 for building their transdisciplinary curricula. This chart is explained more fully in the text that follows. I invite you to look at it now simply to understand what stage of our planning we had reached in 1975. You will see that across the top of the chart we listed eight "competency crystals." These competencies represented comprehensive performance abilities that students would focus on, one by one, over the eight semesters of this baccalaureate program. Down the side of the chart are listed five "dimensions." These are the five different aspects of their performance that we wanted students to be aware of at all times, no matter what competency they were focusing on. The competencies and dimensions together form a matrix which, taken as a whole, describes the fully competent professional. Within this matrix, each cell represents a particular aspect of performance which students will explore during one of the eight crystals.

In 1975, our educational matrix was expressed entirely in terms of performance—what students would be able to *do*. At that time, when the system was so new, we wanted to emphasize above all how we used purposeful performance as the source and inspiration for the academic curriculum. Meanwhile, our faculty was using this matrix on a regular basis to prepare their multidisciplinary curricula, the body of theory and methodology they were using to help students develop the identified performance abilities. A year later, I published a new version of the matrix that showed the rich academic program and varied reading lists which our faculty was developing out of these performance descriptions. This later version of the matrix appears in *The Service Society and a Theory of Learning That Relates Education, Work, and Life,* another paper in this series of reprints.

Audrey C. Cohen
March, 1988

An American society where the majority of workers earn their living in the service sector requires a new, more advanced ethos. Self interest must be replaced by concern for other human beings. Service can no longer be considered a commodity, to be dispensed without humanity, effectiveness, or competence. Service entails shared responsibility between the individual citizen and the professionals who give service; decreasing reliance upon authoritarian expertise; accountability to the public. And if we are to build a society where the highest attainment is outstanding service to people, where rewards and status go to those who contribute most to bettering the human condition, then we must design a new form of higher education that incorporates these new service values.

THE THIRD ALTERNATIVE

With few exceptions, the nation's colleges and universities fit into one of two structural designs or models, the first of ancient lineage, the second fairly recent. In the past few years, we have seen the beginnings of a third, radically different educational paradigm oriented to this country's emerging service-centered society. It is on this third model that I wish to focus, outlining its structure and goals, and discussing its implications. It is my conviction—and my thesis—that in the decades ahead this third model will be widely adopted because it reflects the priorities of our society more realistically than older models. To justify this conclusion, however, it is important to examine the new model in historical context and thus to examine in some detail the two earlier designs.

TWO ALTERNATIVES IN TRADITIONAL EDUCATION

The first and older model of higher education is the most familiar because it is the model through which most of us received our formal education. This model has its roots in the medieval universities of Bologna and Paris, with more recent antecedents in the English, Scottish, and German systems. Institutions which fit this model treat knowledge essentially as a commodity purchasable for so many hours of effort, exchangeable into a currency called credits, and redeemable in a degree after a sufficient amount of time has been served. By dividing areas of knowledge into separate departments these institutions encourage specialization and nurture those who control their operations, including faculty, deans, administrators, and counselors.[1]

Such institutions typically respond to new demands by expanding course offerings in specific departments or, perhaps, by enlarging peripheral programs such as "general studies" or "interdepartmental majors."

Until the 1960s, colleges following this first model represented the major distinction of American higher education. By the 1950s some of these institutions, in the wake of exploding enrollments and participation in such ancillary activities as research services to the government, had grown so large and so diffuse that Clark Kerr labeled them "multiversities." Meanwhile, there also emerged a few highly visible, somewhat isolated institutions—among them St. John's in Annapolis, Antioch, Bennington, Sarah Lawrence, and Black Mountain—which heralded what later became a massive reaction against the impersonality of the "multiversity." Although their initial impact was small, as Gerald Grant and David Riesman observed, "their impact as models for emulation and incorporation has sometimes been large."[2]

In the 1960's, Model I institutions came increasingly under fire from concerned, determined, and occasionally destructive youth. The Vietnam war was a primary catalyzing agent, but a growing awareness of racism, materialism, poverty, and the complicity of the university in ecological destruction, for example, created rebellious attitudes that penetrated colleges and universities and led to widely-publicized questioning of the purpose of education. Did a traditional university education equip anyone to cope with the challenges and issues of the world outside the academic hierarchy?[3] Too often the answer was "No," and as a result, the carefully nurtured Model I environment was threatened. Simply expelling those who fomented disturbance was no longer acceptable or even feasible, first, because too many students were involved, and second, because many faculty members found their own values changing.

Confronted with these new pressures, administrators and faculty no longer felt certain that the old way was best. Some began to search for alternative approaches that might help to defuse tensions. A variety of reforms were instituted to counter the major complaint that college and university programs were too rigid and impersonal. Students were allowed to organize their programs around their special interests—ecology, for example, or community relations; and some courses moved outside the classroom. More non-traditional students—people of different ages and a broader range of backgrounds—were admitted.

Such policies soon became the hallmarks of a major new model of higher education. It drew not only on the earlier innovations mentioned above, such as Black Mountain and Bennington, but also on newer projects such as the Open University in England and Chicago's TV College.

Fragments of this new model had long existed in home learning courses, in "Sunrise Semester" and other television courses, and in the vast military correspondence program. In Model II institutions, the new elements were integrated into curricula designed to respond to student dissatisfaction and the call for broader, more individualized learning experiences.

Introduced in the late 1960's, Model II spread rapidly. In 1968 and 1969, under the strong leadership of Frank Newman, the Newman Committee researched and wrote about the new options, helping to create the climate that enabled Model II to spread and flourish.[5] By the early 1970s the Model II structure was firmly entrenched. Grant and Riesman cite a 1972 survey of 115 colleges which showed that three-quarters of them permitted their students to plan their own course of study and define their major to some degree, while 83 percent granted credit for individual work or study away from campus.[6] By this time, a number of institutions designed solely for independent study had been established, including Empire State, the University Without Walls and its Union Graduate School, and the Regents External Degree Program in New York State.

These programs, designed to meet student demands for freedom to plan their own programs, work independently, receive credit for experience, and focus more directly on individual goals, also acted as a safety valve. Because Model II colleges encouraged independence and flexibility within the traditional university structure, they forestalled any actual destruction of the alma mater itself.

I differ with Grant and Riesman in that I see these student-centered programs as an important change, whereas they do not. However, I do agree with these observers that "the most widespread impact of the pedagogic left was to bring about a considerably greater degree of autonomy for the students; the student customers are freer than before to shop, to pick and choose, to move at their own pace. In that sense, those most popular reforms—contracted majors, free choice curricula, the abolition of fixed requirements—did not seek to establish new institutional aims, but to slow the pace and expand the avenues of approach."[7]

Despite their importance for students, the new programs were, in effect, no more than extensions of the existing system. Model II institutions operate within the same framework as Model I, emphasizing such standard academic trappings as credits, credit-hour equivalents, tests, grades, semester patterns, and professional hierarchies. Most important, the emergence of Model II has altered the primary preoccupations of Model I—scholarship, research, the awarding of degrees—in only a minor way.

REQUIREMENTS OF THE SERVICE SOCIETY

The change represented by Model II simply is not enough. We are a service society. Statistical analysis of occupations demonstrates the existence of this service society and shows that within it a growing focus is, and will continue to be, the "human services." Our national economy is already almost 70 percent service-oriented, and many projections indicate that by the year 2,000, 80 percent of the work force will be concentrated in service fields.[8]

A main priority of the service society is to improve the quality of life for the people of our country. As the percentage of the population involved in either giving or receiving service burgeons, people will become increasingly aware of what good service means. This awareness will, in turn, create a consumer demand for new competence and new accountability from workers.[9]

Within the context of higher education, the accelerating shift to a service society implies the need to prepare professionals in a new way. We must have professionals who can offer citizens a broad range of human services, provided effectively and humanely, and a new assessment system that reflects actual job performance. Professionals must be prepared to concern themselves with all aspects of the welfare of those they help. They must be committed to enabling citizens to manage their own affairs, to working toward goals which have been mutually set with those they serve, and to being assessed by the recipient of service on how these goals have been achieved. Human Service Professionals must be competent and humane, able to work with people of all ages, both individually and in groups, within and outside the family setting. They must be competent to teach, to advise and counsel, and to advocate for the citizens they serve.

These are but a few of the predominant concerns of the new service society. But they are enough to illustrate my next point: education as presently structured has little relevance to these concerns. Present institutions of higher education, whether they fall under Model I or Model II, are not equipped to address these new service priorities. In the first place, they are far too engrossed in maintaining their own power and influence. Second and more important, these institutions are simply not oriented toward the citizen who will be the eventual beneficiary of their students' training and skills. Therefore, just as higher education has changed in the past to respond to what were then new priorities, so it now must change to reflect the human service society.

We are ready for a new kind of institution that will do precisely what is required: it will focus not only on the student, but also on the results of the student's education in terms of its effect on citizens' service needs; it will

establish new criteria for assessment and credentialing based on this new concern. The hallmark of this model must be a true collaboration among the agencies delivering human service, the institutions preparing people for human service occupations, and the consumers of service themselves. This new model must bring together life and learning, encouraging and enhancing each student's ability to do for others what he or she would like done for him or herself.[10]

This third alternative, Model III, contrasts sharply with both earlier models. Unlike Model I, it is not discipline-oriented, specialized, and rationalistic. It goes far beyond the "nontraditional" Model II system which acknowledges the value of learning by experience but attempts to translate this learning into traditional academic terms. Model III is a performance-based system that integrates theory with practice. It assumes that the professional is primarily responsible to the client rather than simply to supervisors or to a bureaucracy, and that professional competence must be redefined in broad, humanistic terms. As a result, the organization of Model III institutions is totally different from either Model I or its more liberal counterpart, Model II.

This third alternative assumes that the kind of ability needed for effective performance in human service is to be found in many places and is widely distributed among socio-economic groups. Model III is more egalitarian than the earlier models because it recognizes that ability and effectiveness are built on more than academic skills, and it demands that certification (and recertification) be based not only on intellectual prowess but also on knowledge translated into performance in real work situations. The sixties saw the beginnings, and subsequent abortion, of a movement toward this kind of institution. In that period, the movement was premature. Today, its time has come.

A PREMATURE EFFORT— THE NEW CAREERS MOVEMENT

Let us look briefly to the sixties. Two parallel developments occurred and they were interrelated. The Federal government began funding "new careers" programs designed to bring low income adults into the mainstream by training them to fill paraprofessional, human service positions within their communities, thereby encouraging social change. Simultaneously, there was a tremendous expansion of community colleges which, seeking to capitalize on the new federal policy, received government funds and proceeded to establish terminal degree programs in paraprofessional fields, especially in the helping areas of such professions as teaching, social work, mental health, law. Both the federal and the institutional programs were limited in scope, and concentrated on one or another specific area within

the community. The end result in both instances fell far short of expectations. Neither under federal training programs nor under community college curricula did adults find the mobility and economic security they sought. Though many were employed in new positions in such helping professions as teaching, social work, and law, once again, unless they pushed on and received traditional academic degrees, they were dead-ended at a job level that was usually well below what they deserved.

With few exceptions, neither federal programs nor community colleges addressed themselves to anything more than the initial training for specific paraprofessional careers. The additional components essential to social change and to creating not only initial employment opportunity but continuing mobility—working and training with service agencies, opening up positions, getting these positions incorporated into the system as a means for improving the delivery of human services, and setting up an alternative route to full professionalism—all of these important efforts were relegated to a secondary position or neglected entirely. In short, the need for an integrated, articulated approach was scarcely considered. No matter how effectively they performed on the job, graduates of community colleges and individuals trained under "new careers" were severely limited in their employment and promotion options. The colleges did not provide the educational follow-up that was needed, and they did not help the agencies to make performance the basis for movement to full professionalism. It seems obvious now that the lack of appropriate responses within higher education short-circuited what could have been a significant movement into new areas of education and employment.

There was another major flaw in the whole "new careers" concept, and this also perpetuated traditional patterns of educational apprenticeship and mobility. Job classification ladders were set up in the new helping occupations paralleling those already existing in civil service. The basic value or suitability of this kind of job classification structure was never questioned. Education and time spent on a job were still the factors controlling the practitioner's mobility. The new ladders made no provision for new performance standards on which to build and encourage a movement to professionalism. Although the bottom rungs became slightly more desirable, the people at the bottom were to remain at the bottom until they got the appropriate degree. And the people at the top would remain there.

The influx of new personnel into the helping professions in the early 1960s did have one positive result. The development of new positions and expansion of the categories of employment, brought about with federal support, helped people to realize the tremendous possibilities in human service employment. As the professions hired these pre-professional staff members, some of the work heretofore handled by "professionals" was now done by

people who did not have six or eight years of post secondary education and who lacked traditional credentials. Unofficially, many non-professional employees were now performing "professional" tasks, and in many cases performing them well. Officially, however, each profession took care to define pre-professional territory in narrow terms, thereby both defending its own already credentialled professionals and sharply curtailing advancement opportunities for the new careerists. The professions were not interested in promoting performance assessment, because that would have allowed too many talented new careerists to qualify as professionals without following the usual long and costly route through graduate school. Thus the service professions themselves encouraged even more fragmented systems for learning and for the delivery of service to citizens.

While a number of institutions of higher education made piecemeal attempts to change, my own institution, the College for Human Services, was one of a very few that moved through a logical process of research and development culminating in an entirely new model of higher education. The model developed at the College for Human Services challenges traditional study and credentialing for the helping professions, structuring professional education to meet the needs of the emerging human service society. The educational design reflects both employee needs for self-esteem and job satisfaction and citizens' needs for effective service delivery. It prepares professionals to fill the diverse roles necessary for effective performance and makes the fundamental connections between theory, practice, and assessment. The College for Human Services represents a complete Model III education.[12]

A CLOSER LOOK AT THE THIRD ALTERNATIVE

With this background, an examination and comparison of the major components of institutions of higher education and how they function under each model will clarify the thrust higher education must take if it is to respond to the service demands of our society, both in terms of jobs and in terms of service delivery. We will examine, in turn, the student body, curriculum, faculty role, and assessment procedures of Model I, II, and III institutions.

1. Student Body

Although many private institutions of the Model I type are highly selective, state institutions have increasingly moved toward a policy of open admissions. Criteria for entrance have been broadened and most high school graduates who apply are guaranteed placement at some institution within the publicly-supported system. However, even these Model I institutions are still primarily interested in the young adult who comes to the university

immediately or shortly after high school graduation and completes his/her course of study by the age of 22 or 23.

Because Model II institutions are more flexible and have allowed significant individualization, they have attracted a broader, more diverse clientele including the traditional young adult; large numbers of persons from minority groups who come from diverse social and educational backgrounds; and older persons, many of them women, just entering college for the first time or returning after a long period of absence.

A Model III institution is concerned with its students' future roles in today's and, increasingly, tomorrow's service-oriented society. It does not rely solely on SAT scores or other academic yardsticks in selecting them. It admits men and women of any age who show that they have the motivation, communication skills, and personal qualities that are necessary for successful education and job performance as human service professionals. These non-academic qualities are considered relevant not only at the time students apply, but also during the educational experience itself. The interpersonal skills and leadership qualities that are part of effective performance are no less essential than academic achievement.[13]

2. Curriculum

In Model I institutions the emphasis is on traditional academic learning together with exposure to the professions via academic disciplines. Through a broad variety of courses in these various disciplines the student is expected to find one area of interest for study in greater depth. This intensive study in a single narrow area is intended to form the basis for his or her future career. Sometimes it does, but very often it does not.

With a more diverse and, in some instances, a more independent student body, Model II institutions loosened their structure and broadened study options. These were the colleges most affected by the federally-funded programs of the sixties which emphasized learning by experience. Course requirements were often liberalized and off-campus alternatives developed. New divisions were established off campus. At least in theory and sometimes in practice, faculty members assumed the role of mentors rather than instructors. Nevertheless, these changes, along with contract systems, learning modules, cluster colleges, and the beginnings of interdisciplinary approaches, ultimately signified little in terms of basic institutional policies. Student success depended on the validation of cognitive learning; the system of credits continued to serve as coin of the realm.

As I noted earlier, the pressures that led to the development of Model II programs on existing campuses also led to the establishment of a number of entirely new institutions devoted to independent study. Empire State College, for example, is part of the State University of New York.

It has no campus, but does offer a faculty counsel. Students at Empire State work under a learning contract. They can utilize the institution's several learning centers throughout the state, or, if they prefer, complete a degree by working at several other institutions with whom Empire State has contracted. Students also have the option of earning their degrees under the College Proficiency Examination Program instituted by the New York State Board of Regents.

The State Regents' Degree Program in New York provides considerable flexibility within the traditional format. The program is concerned only with certifying and validating learning acquired elsewhere. By giving weight to such factors as a student's course grades at other institutions and scores on standardized tests, it allows previously acquired cognitive learning to be validated. Theoretically, such a program allows a person to obtain a degree without ever attending a college or university. But because the program translates everything into old-style academic credits, it is, in effect, merely making the traditional system available to more people, and allowing them to collect through a series of cognitive examinations the credits required for a degree.

The University Without Walls operates somewhat differently. It is a loosely coordinated group of widely divergent institutions in several different states. Though it is itself a degree granting institution, most participating students are degree candidates at their own primary college or university. Study is based on individual or group contracts. The amount of flexibility allowed students varies depending on the requirements of participating colleges and universities.[14]

Both Empire State and UWW were originally set up for the traditional student seeking a broader, more flexible, more personal educational experience (although time has shown that it is more often the older student who takes advantage of these educational opportunities). By contrast, Minneapolis Metropolitan State College has always considered its clientele to be the adult student. MMSC was one of the first institutions to develop ways of evaluating life experience as part of a student's progress towards a degree. It has a small core faculty and an effective community adjunct faculty. Most important, it has developed an assessment program based on competence, which begins to move it out of the more formal Model II category.[15]

As exemplified by the College for Human Services, Model III goes far beyond even the most significant of the innovations just described. Because this new model is concerned with meeting the human service needs of our post-industrial society, its principal goal is to reorganize education to ensure the best possible training of service professionals. It attempts to prepare people to achieve an "ideal" of effective human service by

providing them with an education that incorporates:

- a major role for the client in setting and strengthening performance standards;
- periodic assessment of professionals throughout their working lives.
- a curriculum which blends theory and practice, selecting and organizing theoretical material to relate to job performance.

In the Model III curriculum the blending of theory and practice is very different from the experiential component of traditional cooperative education or work study programs. In the latter, students spend part of the year at their academic institution and part in employment approved by the institution. The work is usually, but not always, related to the student's field of study. In the Model III program, the blending of theory and practice is a continuing process. Each week, and sometimes each day, students divide their time between college classes and contractual employment at a human service agency. They are constantly able to make use of the theoretical material they have been studying, to test it in real work situations, to evaluate their skill in applying it, and to bring questions, difficulties, and illuminating experiences from the agency back into the classroom for further discussion and guidance.

Model III evolved as a direct response to the growing recognition in higher education and in American society that highly specialized, technically competent professionals are often only half trained because their training has in effect been dehumanizing.[16] Too many professional training programs fail to make students aware of their future clients or patients as whole people. They brush aside the complex interactions between society and human nature and fail to explore the value base on which professional institutions rest.

The Model III curriculum stresses service to the client as the primary goal. It teaches student professionals that they must understand themselves in the context of systems of which they are a part and learn how these systems influence professional practice. It seeks to prepare professionals to render ideal human services, structuring their experiences in both the classroom and the agency to achieve this goal.

How can this ideal of service be taught? The first step is to define the ideal. There are several ways of doing this. One is to study the experience of human service educators and the performance of outstanding practitioners in order to determine those techniques and concepts which are common to the work of all creative professionals, providing a common basis for helping citizens improve their lives.[17] Another way is to ask a cross-section of concerned citizens to meet together and determine what they believe are the components of ideal service.

Not surprisingly, the research that has been conducted in this area, including research performed by and for the College for Human Services, has revealed a core of concepts common to the work of creative practitioners in all areas of the helping professions, including law, medicine, teaching, counseling, social work, and health care. These concepts are central to the Model III curriculum. From them, the College has derived eight generic competency areas, or "crystals," which serve as an organizing principle for the curriculum. Around these eight crystals, which students master one by one, theoretical material and practical experiences are organized to provide a series of holistic learning experiences.

From the research on professional performance there has also emerged a set of constants, dimensions of performance that apply not only to the work of professionals but to the lives of all citizens. The five dimensions are concerned with selecting and achieving appropriate goals, choosing values and resolving value conflicts, understanding oneself and others, understanding the systems under which people function, and developing the specific skills needed to achieve one's goals.[18] In professional work focused on people, it is vital not only to define the essential competencies and to learn how they can be put into practice, but also to understand how these dimensions of performance can be recognized and used. Many—perhaps most—professionals would give lip-service to the need for this comprehensive approach to learning and practice. But in fact the practitioners of every profession have, unfortunately, fought long and hard to preserve the unique identity of their profession and to keep outsiders from learning much about it.

A chart of the College for Human Services "Prism" of learning is reproduced in the Appendix at the end of this paper. This chart displays the interrelationships between the eight crystals and the five dimensions of performance. The dimensions are listed vertically down the side of the diagram; the broad performance goals, or competency crystals, are listed horizontally across the top. In each crystal, theory is studied in dimension classes in relation to the performance goal for that crystal. The broad performance goals are, I believe, reasonably self-explanatory. The dimensions of performance and their relationship to the crystals may perhaps be less clear. Let us, therefore, briefly consider them.

The first dimension pertains to establishing appropriate goals and developing strategies for achieving them. Everything we do, from something as simple as going to the market to something as complex as undertaking a new program of service, requires us to set goals. For each successive crystal, students are asked to set a service goal and work to achieve it. All of their learning and practice takes place in the context of this planned effort.

The next dimension calls on the student to "demonstrate a clear and consistent understanding of your values and those of others." Most of us have taken a course or two in philosophy during our undergraduate years. Occasionally we meet a philosophy major who has taken a deeper look at ethics and values. Yet most of us little realize how our value base permeates everything we say and do and how interconnected it is with our whole life. In colleges and universities traditional faculty rarely link the central issues of their individual disciplines in the humanities or the social sciences to universal questions of value. Rarely do they articulate such questions as: "What is the philosophy that underlies this position?" or "What was the ethical issue involved in this decision?" or "Where do I stand on this issue, and what ethical assumptions does my stand reflect?" The Model III curriculum recognizes, for the first time, that values not only influence professional performance, but are fundamental to it.

The third dimension has to do with "understanding yourself and others." Perhaps this will be more easily recognized under such conventional labels as sociology, psychology, and anthropology. Everything we do is affected by our perception of ourselves and others, and yet the average educational consumer takes only a few courses in this area, and even those few are rarely related to our own feelings and the experience of our daily lives. I do not believe that a professional in any helping field can perform useful work without a deep awareness of the humanity that he or she shares with the client. Nor do I think it possible to learn to function as a counselor, supervisor, or community liaison officer, without this dimension.

Fourth, are we sufficiently conscious of the role an understanding of systems plays in our daily life? As administrators or faculty members in a college we are often incapacitated by lack of knowledge not only of the organizational systems that are closest to us—the particular department for which we work, for example. We are often incapacitated by our lack of knowledge about how this system relates to other departments, the total university organization, the larger outside systems such as a city health department or the state board of education. A vital ingredient in becoming a human service professional is the acquisition of a thorough understanding of relevant systems, and the ability to use them as resources.

The final dimension of performance relates to skills. Let me immediately clarify this by stating that I do not refer to basic college-level skills, which all student professionals are expected to have, but rather to the advanced interpersonal skills that are an essential part of professional behavior.

Perhaps the best way to see even more clearly how the dimensions of performance relate to the basic competency crystals is to look closely at one of the crystals. Crystal 5 is concerned with being an effective counselor. Isn't counseling an important part of all professional work? If we provide

legal advice or architectural advice, if we supervise other workers or work only with a group of colleagues, it is inconceivable that a professional will not have to spend some time serving as a sympathetic and effective counselor of others. Every professional, indeed every person, should ideally be expected to become competent in this area. But how can we achieve this? In our Model III program, the answer is to have students spend a period of time studying the counseling crystal as it relates to each of the five dimensions of performance, each of which is taught separately. Then they bring all of the dimensions together in their work at a field placement.

When a professional counsels effectively, his or her actions must reflect suitable goals and relevant values. These actions must be appropriate to the people and systems involved and must utilize appropriate interpersonal skills. These aspects of the competency crystal are constantly reinforced through the dimensions of performance. During the weeks the student spends mastering the counseling crystal, theoretical materials such as reading selections, case studies, and films are assigned, and parallel agency experiences, including work experiences, special seminars, and lectures, are structured to relate to and illuminate that crystal.

3. The Faculty Role

In Model I institutions the faculty has a well-defined role. Teaching is done in classrooms, although students do have the opportunity for individual conferences or some extra help if they request it. But teaching is only one aspect of the faculty function. Equally important if not more so is research published in scholarly journals. This "search for truth" often takes up considerable time and energy. It can lead to the diminution of the teaching function. A faculty member has some power to choose between these two aspects of the job—teaching and research—but the choice is often in favor of research, because promotion and tenure are more and more contingent on outside recognition of a faculty member's scholarly achievement. Quality of teaching is hardly taken into account.

Model II institutions eased this condition at least to some degree. There was more individualized teaching, primarily through mentoring of independent study; however this sometimes resulted in a professor giving one student what used to be a course for many students and, in the process, reducing drastically his or her contact with students generally, since only a handful of students could be accommodated with this time-consuming approach. The teaching role itself was not basically changed under Model II. There was simply an attempt to adapt what had worked in the past to the new choices now open to students. Without a basic change in the faculty role this haphazard process has tended to leave both faculty and students frustrated.

In Model III, the role of the faculty departs radically from tradition. The faculty member is expected to function not only within the institution of higher education, but outside in the service setting as well, since work in the field is an integral component of the training. The desperation of faculty in the late 1960's grew out of a lack of direction, or lack of satisfaction and meaning. Such desperation is unlikely to develop among faculty members in Model III institutions. Opportunities for variation and intellectual development abound. Faculty members are responsible for orchestrating and monitoring learning not only in the classroom, but also in the field, where they work in close cooperation with students and strive to make the agency an educational setting. This is the model for future professional training.

The design of the curriculum facilitates this dual role for the faculty and the agency. The performance outcomes suggested in the chart on pages 30-31 describe in clear operational terms what students are expected to be able to do with the knowledge and skills they acquire. The faculty member is as much an organizer of information and experience as a dispenser of knowledge. Methods of designing the field curriculum and relating it to the academic curriculum vary according to the teaching style of each faculty member, the performance of the agency supervisor, and the needs of students. Once the supervisor and the faculty member have discussed the curriculum chart and understand it, they then decide which elements can be taught in the agency, which in the classroom, and which in a combined agency-classroom experience. Adjustments can be made in the curriculum throughout the year according to students' needs and in response to ideas generated during the educational process.[19] The result is such a rich and varied kaleidoscope of experiences within a given week that the student can scarcely fail to benefit. Another significant aspect of this new faculty role is the opportunity it gives faculty to formulate, directly out of field experiences, new theories about service. Finally, not the least of the faculty member's functions is to demonstrate in his or her own practice a model of the human service professional—accomplished, knowledgeable, and comprehensive in his or her approach to students.

4. Assessment

The most common forms of assessment in Model I institutions are purely cognitive—standardized tests, classroom tests, projects, and papers—and designed to demonstrate factual knowledge and the ability to do research and express results and ideas in a logical and clear manner. Such assessments are based on the assumption, or hope, that the ability demonstrated by good performance on such tests is a fair indication of competent performance in one's chosen profession. But the validity of this assumption has never

really been proven. Christopher Jencks claims that success in life depends primarily on luck and family background and is not related to education.[20] He may be right. My own belief is that Jencks can be proven wrong with a model III educational system and with methods used to measure competence that are different from those described above. With education and assessment changed to focus more on actual performance, as they have been in Model III, I believe we will see a significant correlation between success in schools and achievement in life.

Assessment procedures have been altered slightly in Model II institutions. The increased flexibility for a student within this model has, in some instances, allowed the student to enter into an agreement with his or her faculty mentor as to what process will be used to demonstrate successful completion of a course or project, and to substitute this process for the traditional final examination. Even this small advance exists at relatively few undergraduate institutions. Most of the time, undergraduate assessment still involves a demonstration of intellectual reasoning through some form of writing, ignoring actual performance in human situations. Graduate school assessment also follows this tradition, although in some areas (teacher education in New York State, for example) assessing for competence is being considered.

In the few cases where there has been some concrete attempt to create a structure to facilitate performance assessment at the graduate level, this process has usually bogged down. Among the reasons for this failure are professional jealousies, a reluctance to broaden access to the profession, the desire to preserve professional boundaries, and fears for job security if current professionals are subjected to new performance standards.

The assessment instruments developed as part of Model III provide students with a way to measure their own progress as they strive to improve service delivery. Instead of setting up tests that depend on memory and rote learning, or even tests that merely correlate in some way with practice, Model III tests students in practice. The prime assessment instrument is a series of Constructive Actions that students must perform to demonstrate in the real world the ability to perform well in each of the broad competency crystals that together define the ideal of service. These Constructive Actions also act as learning and teaching vehicles and are an integral part of the Model III curriculum.

A Constructive Action consists of a major piece of service delivery to citizens, planned cooperatively with the citizen, approved in advance by the student's teacher and supervisor, and carried out in the field. A Constructive Action provides the context for assessing a student in each crystal and allows assessment in the field of what students learn in the educational institution. It relates the college and the agency learning experience to

particular human situations that are encountered in a great number of different settings. The written elements include: 1) a proposal or plan prepared by the student outlining the goals of the project, how these goals are to be met, and how the results will be evaluated; 2) ongoing logs in which the student describes day-to-day events related to the project and cites relevant theory; and 3) an evaluation by the student of what has been accomplished using the criteria set forth in the original proposal.[21] This kind of approach demands that practitioners analyze what they propose to do and why, and helps determine whether their plan has real merit. If students under the guidance of professionals record their work in logs, if they analyze the outcomes and are assessed by citizens, then service delivery will surely become more responsible. Professionals who use the process will continue to learn and become more competent because they have turned their own practice into a learning process.[22]

In the counseling competency, for example, criteria for success might include establishing an atmosphere of trust, handling value conflicts, and helping a client take the initiative in problem-solving. The Constructive Action must have 1) collaboration of the citizen consumer; 2) acceptance by the agency supervisor; and 3) encouragement of faculty members. All these participants, including the student, must take part in planning and setting goals and each must assess the results using the predetermined criteria.[23] The Constructive Action is assessed in two ways: for quality of performance and for the student's ability to understand and explain that performance as it relates to the agency's work. The choice of Constructive Actions is almost infinite.[24] Each depends on the crystal being studied and on the needs of clients in the agencies with which the college is collaborating.

Thus, eight times during several years of study, each student must merge theory and practice in performance and have the results evaluated through Constructive Actions. In this way, evaluation becomes a true tool in the process of self-knowledge and improvement of the environment.

THE SPREADING OF MODEL THREE

I believe that the College for Human Services is at present the only institution reflecting all the characteristics of Model III. However, others are moving to incorporate at least part—and in a few cases all—of the new alternative into their own structures. Alverno College, a small liberal arts institution, has redesigned the assessment component of its traditional program. Assessment instruments based on performance are being used to evaluate students' accomplishment within the liberal arts framework of that college. Eagleville Hospital in Pennsylvania is working with Lincoln University to introduce Model III into that state. Lincoln University is attempting to make of its new human services graduate program a genuine Model III

undertaking, embodying theoretical knowledge plus field performance, with the judgment of adequacy of the student to be based as much on effective performance in the field as on effective classwork. The University of Massachusetts School of Education has arranged to work with the College for Human Services in instituting a doctoral program based on the college model. Sonoma State College in California plans to establish a Model III human services program.

A college cannot be considered a true Model III institution for human services until it becomes involved with the goals of its students both while they are in the process of becoming professionals and after they have graduated and are working at their profession. A new method for delivering old services is not enough. Some institutions are heading in the direction of the Model III concept, but only internally; that is, they have accepted performance as a necessary concomitant to theoretical knowledge, but they are not yet interested in the connection with the real world. They have yet to recognize and accept the idea that the ultimate goal for human service education is to achieve social change that will benefit the citizens who receive services. Therefore, these colleges concentrate on change in relation to educational process and its immediate effect on students, whereas Model III education is primarily directed to effective change for and with those who are served. The changes that it brings about inside the educational process are aimed, ultimately, at the client. An essential point is a new perception of "client." The client is no longer a passive receiver of the actions of those who would do good; he or she is now an active participant in the planning and carrying out of the actions that will change his or her life.

The primary objective of the Model III student and graduate must be to free citizens who need human services from the sit-and-wait syndrome. The goal must be to help them achieve their potential, to make them genuine participants in the direction of their own affairs and in the society in which they now merely exist. The proper function of higher education in the field of human services is to embrace both the educational and the change-agent aspects of Model III for student-practitioners and graduates alike. Unfortunately this is all too rare. There is a clear philosophical view underlying Model III—it calls for a significant function for the academy outside the academy's walls.

Only when colleges throughout the country embrace the social as well as the educational aspects of Model III will we be fulfilling our dual role as educators of professionals and transmitters of change to the citizens who need service.

In conclusion, a college structure, such as Model III, that recognizes performance as the prime criterion for advancement will not only have

tremendous impact on the way services are delivered and who is licensed to do the delivering, but will also do much to stem growing dissatisfaction among workers. People want to feel good about the work they do and to feel they are getting better at doing it. This third model is realistic because it is an outgrowth of professional needs and citizen demands. It responds to the priorities of our service society. It is the one model that does not separate the mind from the body, thought from action, or the client from the professional, and that bases advancement and status on performance.

FOOTNOTES

1. Frederick Rudolph, in *The American College and University* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1962), dates the development of the faculty centered institution to the establishment of Johns Hopkins University in 1876. The faculty, its need, and its purposes were central to that university's purpose. Here was recognition of the responsible profession of university teaching . . . "and the discipline of scholarship" (pp. 272-73). Rudolph points out that the university then built its own rationale, mores, peculiarities, and developed some of the rights and privileges of an organization (p. 402). See also Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, *The Academic Revolution* (New York: Doubleday, 1960) for a broader description of the faculty-oriented university.

2. Gerald Grant and David Riesman, "An Ecology of Academic Reform," *Daedalus* (Winter, 1974-75, p. 176).

3. Edward Joseph Shoben, Jr., University of Pittsburgh, elaborated on this point in an address presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Innovation in Higher Education, Chicago, March 21, 1975.

4. For a description and critique of the Open University, see "Planning for Higher Education," Education Facilities Lab Profile #2 (April, 1975).

5. In its "Report on Higher Education," the Newman Task Force, which the author served on, called for greater diversity in higher education, citing the educational lockstep, the homogenization of higher education, the growth of bureaucracy, the professionalization of learning, the illegitimacy of cost effectiveness, the inner direction of graduate education, the credentials monopoly, barriers to women, etc.

6. Grant and Riesman, *op cit.*, pp. 176, 177.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 166.

8. In *The Service Society and the Consumer Vanguard* (New York: Harper and Row, 1974), the authors, Alan Gartner and Frank Riessman, note that by 1950, 51% of employed persons were working in the service sector and 49% in the goods producing sector. In 1968, the ratio stood at 64% to 36%. By 1980, the estimated ratio was 68% to 32% (p. 19). The authors also point out that the service sector generates nearly half the country's gross national product despite an official "accounting system that serves to minimize services." Therefore, they continue, it is difficult to estimate accurately those actually engaged in human services—those occupations characterized by closeness to consumers and a "lack of tangible product" (p. 18). See also Victor Fuchs, *The Service Economy* (New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1968).

9. What such a process might entail in the medical field was explored in "Medical Malpractice," *The Center Magazine* (Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, July-August, 1975, pp. 25-55).

10. Barbara Walton, The College for Human Services, "Proposal to The Carnegie Corporation," 1975.

11. In contrast, The College for Human Services, funded under "New Careers" legislation in its earliest days as the Women's Talent Corps, always demonstrated a multi-pronged thrust incorporating all of these elements in its operation.

12. Currently, the College is working to adapt the model on various campuses and at various institutions throughout the country, including the University of Massachusetts, the Pennsylvania Department of Education, Eagleville Hospital, and Lesley College.

13. In *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America* (New York: Harper and Row, 1973), Christopher Jencks *et. al.* deal in depth with the lack of correlation between schooling, academic excellence, and future success in life.

14. S. V. Martorana and Eileen Kuhns, in *Managing Academic Change*, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975), detail a great number of institutions and programs falling under Model II.

15. Ernest Lynton, in "Distributions Among Key Programs, Organizing Non-Traditional Study," *New Directions for Institutional Research* (No. 4, Winter, 1974, pp. 19-28), describes these and other innovations.

16. Barbara Walton, *op. cit.*

17. At the College for Human Services, for example, seventy of these exemplary professionals—teachers, social workers, psychologists, dentists, etc.—gathered on several occasions to talk about critical incidents from their own practices. These were examples of service delivery with a beginning, middle, and end, occurring over a period of time, which may have gone well or poorly and engendered good or bad feelings, but which, in all cases, had significant effects in terms of the professional's own ideal of practice.

18. *Ibid.*

19. Material from Barbara Walton's "Carnegie Proposal" was incorporated into this section.

20. Christopher Jencks, *op. cit.*

21. The College for Human Services, "Proposed Curriculum, Vols, I and II," as submitted to the New York State Department of Education (Deborah Allen, ed., Fall, 1974).

22. Barbara Walton, *op. cit.*

23. Deborah Allen, unpublished paper.

24. Constructive Actions at the College for Human Services have included: organizing and running a seminar for foster parents to identify and work for improvements in the foster care system; organizing a bilingual in-school and at-home program for a French-speaking student; helping a recently retired man through the New York City bureaucracy so that he can collect a disability pension from his former employer, and using this opportunity to help him adjust to his retirement; modifying the behavior of a white counselor at a community center so that she will deal realistically and respectfully with her young, primarily black and hispanic clientele and in this way diffusing the tension while curbing the destructive behavior generated in the youngsters by this counselor's actions; establishing a relationship with a high school senior whose recent truancy resulted in his failure to graduate, and helping him plan a course of action to enable him to graduate at the end of the next term; helping a community center director become aware of the needs of the children who use his facility so that he initiates programs based on these needs; preparing a 13 year old, mentally retarded boy for participation in an after school center that will help him adjust to his new environment.

THE EIGHT COMPETENCY CRYSTALS

THE EIGHT COMPETENCY CRYSTALS

	I. LEARNING	II. PROFESSIONAL RELATIONSHIPS	III. GROUPS	IV. TEACHING
DIMENSIONS **GOALS/ PURPOSE**	Demonstrate your readiness to work toward realizing your personal and professional goals and helping the College fulfill its mission by joining the College as a learner and potential professional.	Demonstrate reasonable success in achieving specific, planned relationships with one or more clients or pupils and one or more supervisors.	Demonstrate reasonable success in helping a group achieve its common purpose while working toward your individual purpose.	Describe what you plan to do to help individual learners achieve goals you have agreed on together and explain how you will determine that the goals have been realized.
VALUES	Describe your views on the potential of all people for positive growth and change and explain how your views affect your performance. (Allport, Erickson, Maslow)	Explore your beliefs about essential nature of human beings in relation to those of others; explain how your beliefs affect your work. (Hobbes, Skinner, Freud, Erikson, Maslow, Rogers)	Describe your views on issues of decision making in groups and explain how your views affect your performance. (Locke, Mill, Ibsen)	Demonstrate in your performance as a teacher that you are open, honest, caring, and confident of the ability of learners to take increased responsibility for their learning.
SELF & OTHERS	Demonstrate in practice an understanding of preparation as the initial stage of professional practice. (Schwartz, Moustakas, Allport)	Understand and apply aspects of the helping relationship—identifying the client, making a beginning, establishing trust, sharing expectations, fostering self-direction. (Perlman, Schwartz, Rogers, Rosenthal, Combs)	Demonstrate in practice an understanding of alternative approaches to working in groups and their applicability to specific situations. (Maslow, Lewin, Coyle, Bales, Thelen, Bennis)	Show that you understand and can use various theoretical approaches to learning both as a teacher and as a learner. (Piaget, Skinner, Bruner)
SYSTEMS	Demonstrate your understanding of the components of the new Human Service profession—new service delivery, assessment, education—in relation to the traditional professions. (Dumpson, Gartner, Rosner)	Demonstrate in practice an understanding of your responsibilities as a student-practitioner in your agency: service goals, work responsibilities, standards, regulations, agency styles.	Demonstrate in practice an understanding of groups as cultural units. (Kluckhohn, Barnouw, Goode)	Show an understanding of the issue of equal educational opportunity; explain the issue in relation to your values, and describe how it affects your work as a teacher. (Clark, Katz, Harvard Educational Review)
SKILLS	Demonstrate that you are able to use problem solving skills to determine and rank long and short range goals and develop alternate strategies for reaching them.	Use assessment skills to record and analyze critical incidents related to your establishing professional relationships at the worksite.	Demonstrate the ability to use interpersonal skills as appropriate to one's role as group member or leader. (Miles, Schwartz)	Use research skills to find appropriate learning resources and to investigate your agency as a system for promoting learning.

V. COUNSELING	VI. COMMUNITY LIAISON	VII. SUPERVISION	VIII. SOCIAL CHANGE
Choose a particular counseling relationship and demonstrate reasonable success in helping those you counsel work toward resolution of their problems.	Describe the people you will work with and the methods you will use to accomplish a goal you have set for your work as a community liaison.	Enable someone you supervise to establish a purpose for his or her work that meets the performance requirements and values of the agency, the College, the worker and yourself.	Propose how inadequacies that you encounter in service delivery might be met through improvements in existing services or the creation of new services.
Demonstrate in counseling practice that you are flexible, tough, willing to risk yourself, resilient in the face of difficulty, optimistic and able to remain focused in confused or emotional situations.	Compare your views on the meaning of community with those of others, and relate them to your work: community as geography, shared beliefs, common institutions, sense of loyalty, working together. (King, Socrates)	Reflect in your performance as a supervisor the belief that work should provide people with opportunities for growth and satisfaction.	Describe your views in relation to others on appropriate ways to effect needed change: through strong leaders, special interest groups, the system. (Gandhi, Nader, Civil Rights Act of 1964)
Show an understanding of various approaches to helping and their applicability to specific situations: guidance; psychotherapy; reality therapy; case work; behavior therapy.	Demonstrate in practice an understanding of cultural and historical attitudes toward individual-community relationships and their connection to the views of you and your constituents. (Hawthorne, Jefferson, Myrdal, Glazer and Moynihan)	Demonstrate in practice an understanding of various theoretical approaches to supervision and an ability to use them appropriately. (Lipset et al, Blau and Scott, Bennis, Janowitz)	Demonstrate in practice an understanding of the nature of change as it affects your role as a change agent. (Warren, Lippitt, Fanon)
Analyze your agency as a system for helping people resolve problems and describe its effects on your performance as a counselor in specific situations.	Describe your agency as a system to help community members meet their needs and as part of a network of systems for helping community members to meet their needs.	Demonstrate in practice an understanding of various conceptual models of organization and their implications for supervision. (Merton, Weber, March, Simon and Likert)	Show an understanding of significant historical efforts to solve community problems through social action and analyze their implications for your performance.
Work with others of different age, race and culture; use interpersonal skills to establish an environment for sharing, promote active listening, help others define problems and seek solutions that will expand their potential.	Make appropriate use of research skills to survey the population of your community; define its housing, education, health, social service, recreation and communications needs and resources.	Use research skills to develop a process for the ongoing acquisition of new ideas and techniques that will be helpful in working as a supervisor to improve service delivery.	Use communication skills appropriately to negotiate between people who have divergent interests and needs.